

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 28, 2007, Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harris et al. (WO '699), Miller or Bjelkhagen. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 2 of the Office Action. For the reasons that follow, Applicant traverses the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and of Claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 1 the wording "in particular a banknote," which was objected by the Examiner, has been deleted.

Furthermore, in Claim 1 the words "particles" and "colloidal" have been introduced to make clear that the photosensitive preparation capable of forming a film comprises a substance capable of producing colloidal metal *particles* or *colloidal* semiconducting particles. This makes it clear that the semiconducting particles are also colloidal, and therefore of the same colloidal nature as the colloidal metal particles. These amendments address the objection that the former wording of Claim 1 was indefinite. A corresponding amendment has been made to Claim 2.

In Claim 4, the antecedent basis for the expressions "said film forming polymer" and "said precursor" has been properly created. This was done by incorporating into Claim 4 the wording of Claim 2.

In Claim 6 the wording "wherein the step of providing a photosensitive preparation on a portion of said security document" has been introduced to make it clear to which step of Claim 1 the specific steps of Claim 6 refer to. In Claim 7 a corresponding amendment has been made.

Further, in Claims 6 and 7 the term "security paper" has been replaced by "security document" to establish a proper antecedent basis.

In Claims 7 and 11 the "in particular" wording has been removed in order to address the objections made under paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled.

New Claims 22-33 have been added.

Among the new claims, Claims 22-24 are dependent process claims based on the features that have been deleted from Claims 1, 7 and 11.

Claims 25-33 are new claims directed to a security document, with Claim 25 being the sole independent claim. Claim 25 recites structural features relating to a photosensitive preparation, wherein the preparation is capable of forming a film on a portion of the security document, and wherein the preparation is capable producing colloidal metal or semiconducting particles under the effect of UV irradiation.

New dependent Claims 26-29 are based on the wording of Claims 2-5.

New dependent Claim 30 is based on cancelled Claim 17.

New dependent Claims 31-33 are based on the features of Claims 1, 12 and 13.

The foregoing amendments to the claims address all the §112 rejections that were made with respect to the claims previously on file.

Concerning the rejections of Claims 16 and 17, in view of the prior art, Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled.

Turning now to the §102(b) rejections, none of the prior art documents cited discloses a security document comprising a photosensitive preparation on a portion of the document, wherein the preparation is capable of forming a film on the portion and wherein the preparation comprises a substance capable of producing colloidal metal particles or colloidal semiconducting particles under the effect of UV radiation.

For all of these foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing claim amendments, reconsideration of the present application in light thereof, and in light of the remarks set forth above, and then allowance of Claims 1-15 and 18-33, as amended, over all the prior art of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Clifford W. Browning
Reg. No. 32,201
Krieg DeVault LLP
One Indiana Square
Suite 2800
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 238-6203

KD_IM-1324133_1.DOC